

Remarks

The Office Action mailed March 29, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-19, 21-32, and 34-39 are now pending in this application. Claims 14-19, 21-23, 25, 27-32, 34-35, and 37-38 stand rejected. Claims 20, 24, 33 and 36 stand objected to. Claims 20 and 33 have been cancelled. Claims 1-13, 26, and 39 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action, and per our telephone conversation on March 23, 2006, Applicants elect for prosecution, with traverse, in this application all claims of Group II, as identified in the Office Action. Claims 14-25 and 27-38 are in the elected claim group.

The restriction requirement is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims in Groups I and II clearly are related. It is believed that a thorough search and examination of either claim group would be relevant to the examination of the other group. In addition, requirements for restriction are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is requested.

The objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 (a), is respectfully traversed. Specifically, under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 (a), features disclosed in the description and claims need not be shown in the drawings where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention. More specifically, the Federal Circuit has opined in *Verve LLC v. Crane Cams, Inc.*, 65 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053-1054 (Fed. Cir. 2002), that “[p]atent documents are written for persons familiar with the relevant field; the patentee is not required to include in the specification information readily understood by practitioners, lest every patent be written as a comprehensive tutorial and treatise for the generalist, instead of a concise statement for persons in the field.” In the present application, Applicant respectfully submits that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art, after reading the specification in light of the Figures, would understand how an exhaust of an auxiliary engine can be channeled

independently from an exhaust of a propelling engine. For example, as recited in paragraph [0021], “[i]n an alternative embodiment, exhaust airflow 80 is not mixed with core engine exhaust flow 32, but rather is discharged independently from exhaust flow 32.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the recitations of Claims 9, 26, and 39 are supported by the specification, and would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 (a) be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 23, 25, 31, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

Claims 23, 25, 31, and 35 have been amended to address the issues noted in the Office Action. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejections of Claims 23, 25, 31, and 35 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 14-19, 27-30, 32, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b and/or e) as being anticipated by Denning et al. (G.B. 2,074,654) (“Denning”) or Albero et al. (U.S. Patent 6,868,664) (“Albero”) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 has been canceled and Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 20, which was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Denning or Albero.

Claims 15-19 and 17-28 depend from independent Claim 14. When the recitations of Claims 15-19 and 17-28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 15-19 and 17-28 likewise are patentable over Denning or Albero.

Claim 33 has been canceled and Claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 33, which was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable if rewritten in

independent form. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 29 is submitted to be patentable over Denning or Albero.

Claims 30, 32, 37, and 38 depend from independent Claim 29. When the recitations of Claims 30, 32, 37, and 38 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 29, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 30, 32, 37, and 38 likewise are patentable over Denning or Albero.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 14-19, 27-30, 32, 37, and 38 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 21-23, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denning or Albero in view of Schwent (U.S. Patent 3,971,208) (“Schwent”) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 has been canceled and Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 20, which was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Denning or Albero in view of Schwent.

Claims 21-23 depend from independent Claim 14. When the recitations of Claims 21-23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 21-23 likewise are patentable over Denning or Albero in view of Schwent.

Claim 33 has been canceled and Claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 33, which was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 29 is submitted to be patentable over Denning or Albero in view of Schwent.

Claims 34 and 35 depend from independent Claim 29. When the recitations of Claims 34 and 35 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 29, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 34 and 35 likewise are patentable over Denning or Albero in view of Schwent.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 21-23, 34, and 35 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 20, 24, 33, and 36 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20 and 33 have been canceled. Claim 24 depends from independent Claim 14, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 24 are considered in combination with the recitations of independent Claim 14, Applicants submit that Claim 24 is, likewise, in condition for allowance. Claim 36 depends from independent Claim 29, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 36 are considered in combination with the recitations of independent Claim 29, Applicants submit that Claim 36 is, likewise, in condition for allowance.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the objection to Claims 20, 24, 33, and 36 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert B. Reeser III
Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070